

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 16-18, 49, 50, 60, 61, 82 and 110 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vong et al (US 2004/0021415 A1) in view of Tang et al (US 5,294,870)

Claims 1 and 110 are the only independent claims remaining in the application. Claim 110 is believed to be representative. This claim sets forth an organic light-emitting device including a luminescent layer disposed between the anode and the cathode. An important feature of this invention is that the luminescent layer includes a host and at least one dopant, the host of the luminescent layer is selected to include a solid organic material including a mixture of at least two components, one of which is capable of forming both monomer state and an aggregate state.

Applicant believes that no one has disclosed or suggested the use of a host mixture for receiving a dopant wherein the host mixture has at least two components, one of which is capable of forming both monomer state and an aggregate state. The advantages of this host structure are clearly and disclosed set forth in the application. The Examiner's attention is called to page 4, lines 20-26.

Vong et al disclose an organic light emitting device that includes a passivation region on an electrode. As part of their disclosure they set forth a long list of materials that can be used in their luminescent region 116 (see paragraphs 0032-0036). These paragraphs presumably include host materials but there is no mention of including a mixture of host materials. Furthermore, paragraph 0036 discusses dopants and pyranes are disclosed as potential dopants. Applicant fails to appreciate how this list of possible materials can in any way set forth a disclosure which would enable one skilled in the art to provide the claimed host mixture.

Applicant does not believe there is any motivation for one skilled in the art to select from the large list of possible materials and provide the claimed host combination. The number of combinations of possible materials is so large that it clearly indicates that the Examiner's rejection is an obvious to try one, which of course is not an appropriate test.

Tang et al does teach the fluorescent dye as noted by the Examiner but this is a dopant but not a host material. Moreover, Tang et al do not disclose

or provide any motivation for the claimed host material mixture. The Examiner's attention is called to U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0048688 which discloses the use of a mixed host. Neither this reference nor the art cited by the Examiner disclose the claimed host mixture wherein the luminescent layer has at least two components, one of which is capable of forming both monomer and aggregate states. As noted above, Applicant can find no motivation for this new and unobvious host mixture in the above discussed art.

Claims 1 and 110 are believed set forth new and unobvious subject matter. The remaining depend upon claim 1 and should be allowed along with it.

If there are any problems with this communication, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/das  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone 585-477-4653

Faxsimile 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.